REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated March 15, 2004. Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1-18 are rejected. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16 have been amended. Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 17 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 18 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald et al (6053951) and Ahanessians et al (6401230). The Examiner states:

> Regarding claim 1, McDonald et al show interfacing with a plurality of wizards in a computer system (Abstract, col. 4 lines 34-45), including: providing a link associated with a wizard (col. 11 lines 30-45), providing the wizard when the link is selected comprising a visual object associated with the link (col. 11 lines 35-65, col. 12 lines 10-41). McDonald et al do not go into the launchpad details, but do show convenient accessing of the wizard (col. 11 lines 20-40, Figure 7). Furthermore, Ahanessians et al show the launchpad comprising a visual object providing information pertaining to a wizard task (Figure 1, col. 6 lines 40-67, col. 7 lines 40-60) for convenient accessing of the wizard. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in McDonald et al, because it would provide a convenient way to access the wizards...

Applicant respectfully disagrees as to the claims as amended. The present invention, as provided in amended independent claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16, provide a method for interfacing with a plurality of wizards in a computer system, comprising the step of: providing a link on a launch pad, wherein the link is associated with a wizard, wherein the launch pad comprises a first visual object, wherein the first visual object provides information pertaining to a task performed by the wizard; and providing the wizard when the link is selected, wherein the wizard comprises a second visual object, wherein the second visual object is associated with the first visual object, wherein the second visual object provides more information pertaining to the task performed by the wizard than the first visual object. Through the association of the first and second visual objects, the user is guided to the correct order in which to execute the wizards and given information as to the effect of the wizard.

The Examiner argues that McDonald discloses "providing the wizard when the link is selected comprising a visual object associated with the link". The Examiner further argues that "McDonald et al do not go into the launchpad details, but do show convenient accessing of the wizard… Furthermore, Ahanessian et al show the launchpad comprising a visual object providing information pertaining to a wizard task for convenient accessing of the wizard."

However, the amended independent claims do not recite a visual object associated with the link. Instead, these claims recite a first visual object which provides information pertaining to a task performed by the wizard, and a second visual object associated with the first visual object, which provides more information pertaining to the same task. By providing this information, the first and second visual objects guide the user to the correct order in which to execute the wizards and give the effect of the wizard. They are not provided on the launch pad for "convenient" accessing of the wizard, but to assist the user in determining how to use the wizards within a larger process.

In addition, even assuming that McDonald discloses a visual object on a launch pad and that Ahanessian discloses a visual object on the wizard, this combination is insufficient to teach the present invention as claimed. Neither McDonald nor Ahanessian teaches associating the visual object on the launch pad with the visual object on the wizard, both providing information pertaining to the task performed by the wizard, where the visual object on the wizard provides more information than the visual object on the launch pad. It is this association between the visual objects that the user is given the visual cue that the information provided by the two visual objects pertains to the same task. With this association, the user is guided to the correct order in which to execute the wizards and given information as to the effect of the wizard. McDonald in view of Ahanessian does not teach this association.

Thus, for these reasons, McDonald in view of Ahanessian does not teach or suggest:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

providing a link on a launch pad, wherein the link is associated with a wizard, wherein the launch pad comprises a first visual object, wherein the first visual object provides information pertaining to a task performed by the wizard; and providing the wizard when the link is selected, wherein the wizard comprises a second visual object, wherein the second visual object is associated with the first visual object, wherein the second visual object provides more information pertaining to the task performed by the wizard than the first visual object, in combination with the other elements as recited in amended independent claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16.

Applicant further submits that claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18 are also allowable because they depend on the above allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 18 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

June 15, 2004
Date

Michele Liu
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,875
(650) 493-4540